

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 4, 2003**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on November 4, 2003 at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Nesbitt in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None.

STAFF PRESENT: Will Wong, Community Development Director; Reg Murray, Associate Planner; James Michaels, Assistant Planner; Tom Fossum, Public Works Director; Janet Ferro, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM III: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from October 7, 15 and 21, 2003 were approved as amended.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM V: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Variance – Cingular Wireless Tower Extension (Diamond Ridge Subdivision) – File VA 03-3.** The applicant requests approval of a Variance to extend the height of an existing PG&E transmission tower by seven feet (7') to accommodate a support structure for six (6) panel antennae.

James Michaels gave the staff report. The applicant, Cingular Wireless, is proposing this tower height extension so that they can provide continuous coverage of its wireless communications services along the Auburn-Folsom corridor, and staff requires approval of a Variance to allow the support structure to exceed the height of the existing tower. Staff supports the request. Chairman Nesbitt noted that the tower expansion/support structure was already in place and was taller than the 7 feet indicated on the plans and in the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

Bruce Piland, Cingular Wireless, gave additional information.

Jerry Larson, vice president of the Oakridge Homeowners Association who lives adjacent to the proposed tower extension, stated that he approves of the proposal.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. McCord **MOVED** to:

A. Adopt the following Findings of fact for the Variance for Cingular Wireless Tower Extension:

1. That the granting of the variance is not inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the R-1 zone district in which the subject property is situated.
2. That because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the provisions of this chapter is found to deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity in the same zone district.

B. Approve the Variance for Cingular Wireless Tower Extension subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit "A" of the staff report.

Comm. Manning **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

The chairman announced the 10-day appeal period.

B. Civic Design and Tree Permit – 660 Auburn Folsom Road (Skyridge Courtyard) – Files CD 03-7, TP 03-6. The applicant requests approval of a Civic Design to construct one (1) two-story and two (2) one-story retail/office buildings totaling approximately 22,119 square feet. A Tree Permit is also required to address potential impacts to two native oak trees.

James Michaels gave the staff report. He reviewed the proposal, describing the style, colors and materials of the proposed buildings. He reviewed the landscaping, noise mitigation, and retaining wall/fence. He noted that staff recommends approval with the proposed conditions.

Comm. McCord stated she wanted the record to reflect that the staff report states "...the design is consistent with the Planning Commission's architectural direction provided on August 19, 2003." The August 19 minutes show that three Commissioners stated they preferred a different style than the "Mission" and that is not noted anywhere in the staff report. Also at that meeting the Commission went on to approve the "Mission" style, which McCord felt is somber and more suited for medical buildings.

Chrm. Nesbitt noted that he was the swing vote at that meeting, he preferred the "craftsman" style, however he understood the design standard and consistency issues and ultimately voted for the mission style.

The public hearing was opened.

Robert Grossman, project developer, gave additional information and noted that they tried to minimize impacts of the project on the surrounding area.

Comm. Manning noted concerns with traffic at the intersection of Herdal and Auburn Folsom Road, the northeast corner of the building. Chrm. Nesbitt noted that Auburn Folsom Road southbound also decreases from two lanes to one lane immediately adjacent to the entrance on Auburn Folsom Road in front of this commercial proposal.

There was discussion of the possibility of additional traffic hazards created by this construction. The Commissioners were concerned that construction

of this center would exacerbate existing traffic problems due to the lane transition occurring just at the entrance to the complex.

Public Works Director Fossum added information on why, because of road width, it was not possible to delay the traffic lane transition further south on Auburn Folsom Road. He did not feel that this project would create any greater traffic problems than already existed.

Randy Wall, R & B Engineering, pointed out that because of the traffic light at the intersection, there would be sequential openings in traffic for vehicles exiting the complex as the light turned red. He also suggested a stop sign at the exit from the complex, as well as a raised curb to slow traffic entering and exiting.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Hale approves of the project and likes the location. However, she added that the ingress/egress problem should be solved before approval. She felt if the Commissioners approved the project now they would be adding to an existing problem, that with cars slowing down to enter the center and other cars accelerating to merge, it would create an impossible situation. She felt she needed to see how more traffic lanes could be created to alleviate this potential problem.

Comm. McCord agreed, she also felt this should be taken care of before approval.

Comm. Manning stated that he loved this project but hated the road situation. He, too, agreed that this is the time to attempt to resolve this situation as he feels this is a good location for the project.

The public hearing was reopened.

Randy Wall returned to state that the applicant is sensitive to the Commissioner's concerns. He stated he would not recommend widening the lanes at this point as the cars must merge in this area. His suggestion was a "taper" approach to the complex, this would be a distinct point where the road starts to close and then opens back up again for thru traffic. The road could be striped with merge striping and arrows coming in, possibly with right turn arrows to direct traffic into Skyridge Courtyard. He added that the applicant would be willing to install the taper as part of the project.

Comm. McCord stated she would prefer to have the applicant come back with a detailed plan.

Director Fossum stated he could not comment on the taper as he did not have enough details on the length, width, etc., and he needed more information on distances. He also noted that there needed to be a taper out of the complex to use as an acceleration lane into the street.

Comm. Hale and Wall did not believe there needed to be a taper out of the complex, that anyone exiting could wait for the red light at the intersection to stop traffic.

Robert Grossman asked if the project could be approved conditionally so that a traffic solution could be found.

Comm. Smith stated he felt this problem needed to be addressed with drawings that are approved by the Planning Commission before they could take action on the project. He stated that this is one of the best prepared projects he has seen but he could not vote for it until he has seen what the solution to the traffic problem will be.

Comm. Manning felt that if the project is conditioned properly, he saw no reason why the applicant could not go forward with the other aspects of the project.

Randy Wall pointed out that the introduction of a taper designed in accordance with the CalTrans Highway Design Manual is a standard approach for this type of situation. He felt the taper is the best option, it would be designed correctly so that cars can slow down to enter the project.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. McCord stated that she had no objection to the project, however she believed the project should not be approved until the new plans for the front traffic area were reviewed.

Comm. Hale stated that she approved of the project and agreed with Mr. Grossman's solution, that the project be approved conditionally. She noted that if a viable solution were not found, the Commission could allow no egress onto Auburn Folsom Road limiting it to Herdal Drive. She did not like this option, however it was a possibility if staff and the developer could not find a solution to the problem.

Comm. Smith stated that some form of redesign would have to be done to the front of the property. He felt that until he saw that redesign, he could not support the project, even though he did like the proposal.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to amend Condition 12 as follows:

In order to minimize noise disturbance for the adjacent residential area, all businesses are ~~prohibited from~~ **restricted in** providing outdoor amplified ~~music, voices, or any other sound. This includes, but is not limited to, installing outdoor audio-related equipment (i.e. loudspeakers).~~
sounds to the following:

- a. **Outdoor amplified sounds, audio equipment, performers and guest speakers shall be restricted to the courtyard area fronting Auburn Folsom Road.**
- b. **Amplified sounds, performers, and guest speakers shall comply with all existing City noise ordinances.**

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

Amendment approved unanimously by voice vote.

Comm. Hale **MOVED** to add a Condition under Public Works "Streets:"

"The final street design along Auburn Folsom Road at the driveway to Skyridge Courtyard shall come back to the Planning Commission for approval."

Comm. Manning **SECONDED**.

Approved unanimously by voice vote.

Comm. McCord noted a concern that if the street changes only came back to the Commission, any changes they saw to the project at that time could not be addressed as their discussion would be restricted to that one item.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to find the project Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15332.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to approve the Civic Design for Skyridge Courtyard – 660 Auburn Folsom Road subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A of the staff report as modified by the Planning Commission.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: McCord, Smith
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to adopt the following findings of fact for the Tree Permit:

1. Approval of the tree permit will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare;
2. Approval of the tree permit is consistent with the provisions of this chapter; and
3. Measures have been incorporated in the project or the permit to mitigate impacts to remaining trees or to provide replacement for trees removed.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to approve the Tree Permit for Skyridge Courtyard subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Comm. Hale **SECONDED**.

AYES: Hale, Manning, McCord, Smith, Chrm. Nesbitt
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

The Chairman announced the 10-day appeal period.

The Chairman called for a short break.

The meeting reconvened at 8:25 p.m.

C. Civic Design – 2350 Lindbergh Street (Nella Oil) – File CD 03-10. The applicant requests approval of a Civic Design to construct a 20,000 square foot two-story office building. *THIS ITEM IS CONTINUED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF NOVEMBER 18, 2003.*

D. Ordinance Amendment for Design Review and Historic Preservation. The City of Auburn proposes to revise the Zoning Ordinance by adopting a Design Review Ordinance and a Historic Preservation Ordinance, thereby replacing Article 8 (Design Control) of the current ordinance. The Design Review Ordinance clarifies the development procedures for the City and the Historic Preservation Ordinance provides for the protection of historic properties within the Historic Design Review District and establishes the procedures and responsibilities related to development within the district. The Zoning Ordinance sections being amended include: 9-4.115; 9-4.517; 9-4. (801-819); 9-4.1005; 9-4.1006, and 9-4.1009. *THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF OCTOBER 21, 2003.*

Reg Murray gave a brief staff report. He reviewed the discussion at the October 21, 2003 meeting and noted that tonight's discussion would be on the Historic Preservation Ordinance. He advised that Bridget Barnes, representing California Association of Business Professional and Resource Owners, had noted concerns in a letter presented at the last meeting. Staff has since contacted Ms. Barnes and reviewed the issues noted in the letter, addressing her concerns. She had misunderstood some of the issues discussed at a previous meeting that were explained to her satisfaction and she is now in agreement with the Commission's actions to date.

The public hearing was opened.

Sandra Elder gave additional information on several items.

The public hearing was closed.

The public hearing was reopened.

Donna Howell also pointed out areas where she had concerns with the ordinance.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Manning **MOVED** to approve the Historic Preservation Ordinance as modified by the Planning Commission.

Comm. Smith **SECONDED**.

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The next item to be reviewed will be the Design Guidelines at the meeting of December 2, 2003.

ITEM VI:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

A. City Council Meetings

Director Wong reviewed recent City Council meetings.

B. Future Planning Commission Meetings

Comm. Hale would like to have a discussion of parking requirements at a future meeting.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be November 18, 2003.

C. Reports

i. Review of Application Submittal Information

At a recent meeting the Planning Commission requested to review the City's submittal requirements on development projects. Specifically, the Commis-

sion expressed interest in requiring additional information that would help to illustrate the project site in relation to surrounding properties (e.g. photographs).

Submittal information alternatives were discussed.

Comm. Smith **MOVED** to change current submittal information as follows:

1. For Civic Design and Subdivision applications, the applicant shall provide digital photographs from all abutting streets of the subject site and adjacent properties within 100'.
2. For Civic Design applications, the applicant shall provide either photographs of the project site with images of the project digitally superimposed in the photographs, or enhanced architectural elevations expanded to include the project site. The photographs or expanded elevations of the project site should illustrate the relationship of the development to the project site and surrounding properties. The images shall include all adjacent properties within 100'.
3. For Subdivision applications, the applicant shall provide either architectural elevations or photographs of the project site with images of the project digitally superimposed in the photographs, or architectural elevations of the project site illustrating the relationship of the development to the project site and surrounding properties. The images shall include all adjacent properties within 100'.

This will become effective December 16, 2003.

Comm. Manning **SECONDED**.

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

ITEM VII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

None.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Commission
November 4, 2003

Janet Elaine Ferro, Administrative Secretary